



AF/2672
2700

#8

Quill

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re the application of
Shinya MATSUMOTO et al.

U.S. Serial No. 09/658,594

Group Art Unit: 2672

Filing Date: September 8, 2000

Examiner: D. Chung

Title: METHOD OF AND APPARATUS FOR RENDERING IMAGE, RECORDING
MEDIUM, AND PROGRAM

RESPONSE TO OFFICE ACTION UNDER 37 CFR 1.116

RECEIVED

Mail Stop AF
Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

SEP 17 2003

Technology Center 2600

Sir:

In response to the Office Action dated June 20, 2003, reconsideration of the rejections in view of the attached submission and the following remarks is respectfully requested.

Request for Reconsideration

The Office Action of June 20, 2003 has been received and carefully considered. The following remarks and attached submission are being provided as a full and complete response to the Office Action. No new matter has been introduced and no new issues have been presented.

In the final Office Action, the Examiner has applied new cited references against the pending claims.

Specifically, claims 1, 5-7, 11-13 and 17-47 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Montag et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,920,492) in view of Seefeldt et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,448,971). The same claims were also rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ebersole et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,920,492) in view of Seefeldt et al.

Thus, it is seen that both of the rejections rely heavily on the newly cited reference to Seefeldt et al. However, Seefeldt et al. has an earliest effective date of January 26, 2000 and can be removed as an effective reference by assertion of the applicant's priority claim and date of September 10, 1999.


In order to perfect the priority claim, a Verified Translation of the Priority Document is being submitted with this response. Having perfected the claim to priority under 35 U.S.C. § 1.119 and in accordance with 37 C.F.R. § 1.55, it is respectfully submitted that Seefeldt et al. can no longer be relied upon as a reference, and therefore the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) are both rendered moot. Withdrawal of the prior art rejections is respectfully requested.

The Examiner has restated his request that the present specification be reviewed to correct informalities. The applicants have conducted a thorough review of the specification and it is respectfully submitted that, as currently written, the specification is fully intelligible and enabling to any person skilled in the art. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of this request is respectfully requested.

For the foregoing reasons, it is respectfully submitted that claims 1, 5-7, 11-13 and 17-47 are in condition for allowance.

No fees are due. Notwithstanding, should it be deemed that other fees, or deficiencies in fees, are required in connection with this or any accompanying communication, such amounts may be charged to the Attorney's Deposit Account No. 07-2519.

Respectfully submitted,



Paul A. Guss
Reg. No. 33,099
Attorney for Applicants

CS-08-020311
775 S. 23rd St. #2
Arlington, VA 22202

Tel. 703-486-2710